

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed October 27, 2008, claims 153–156, 158–166 and 168–171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirements.

Claims 153–156, 158–166, 167–171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 153–155, 158–165, and 168–171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker (U.S. Patent No. 6,227,972) in view of Crouch (U.S. Patent No. 5,580,053).

Claims 156 and 166 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Crouch and further in view of Walker ‘765 (U.S. Patent No. 6,364,765).

### **35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Responsive to the rejection of claims 153–156, 158–166 and 168–171 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and claims 153–156, 158–166 and 167–171 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, independent claims 153 and 162 have been amended to a commensurate scope as the specification. In addition to the above-mentioned

amendments of independent claims 153 and 162, claims 164, 165, 168 and 169 have been amended to more clearly define the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented in the amendment conform to all applicable requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112 and request that the rejections be withdrawn. Applicants note that such amendments are not intended to limit the claimed invention. Rather, such amendments are made solely in response to the rejections recited in the Office Action.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

- Walker (U.S. Patent No. 6,227,972) in view of Crouch (U.S. Patent No. 5,580,053)
- Walker in view of Crouch and further in view of Walker '765 (U.S. Patent No. 6,364,765).

Responsive to the rejection of claims 153–155, 158–165, and 168–171 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Crouch and the rejection of claims 156 and 166 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Crouch and further in view of Walker '765, Applicants note that dependent claims 154–156 and 158–161 depend from independent claim 153, and dependent claims 163–166 and 168–171 depend from independent claim 162.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 154–156, 158–161, 163–166 and 168–171 are not obvious in view of the combination of Walker, Crouch and Walker '765 because these references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed limitations of the amended claims. Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus,

are independently patentable. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 153–156, 158–166 and 168–171 have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is complete and claims 153–156, 158–166 and 168–171 are patentably distinct, and therefore request that the application be moved forward for patenting.

Respectfully submitted,

/mhein/

Marvin A. Hein  
Reg. No. 63,376  
Agent for the Applicants  
Bally Technologies  
6601 South Bermuda Road  
Las Vegas, NV 89119  
Direct 702.584.7209